Form C-104 Rev. 10/07

VALUE ENGINEERING CHANGE PROPOSAL MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

~	-				Date <u>03/19/10</u>		
Contract ID	100122-202			Job No.	J2P0779C/J2P0779D		
County Ran	dolph	Route	24	Origina	ll Bid Cost _2,012,213.80		
Contractor	APAC-Missouri, Inc.			By Casey Castrop			
Designed By	MoDOT			Phone	573-449-0886		
VECP#	10-31	·		VECP	⊠ or VECP/PDU □		
					dvantages/Disadvantages		
grade and repl type of work it After coring th place the concr impact on the l 2. Estimate of 3. Prediction	laced with 4" Type 1 Bate will inconvenience the nese concrete entrances rete drives. Thus saving businesses and traveling freduction in construct of any effects the propose and operations.	ase rock a 3 busines with resu g MoDO g public. ion costs.	and 11.25" of sses associate ults showing F \$6,892.42 a Please see th	SP250. Id within 8" of thic nd expedie attache	kness, APAC proposes to use in iting the project and lessening the		
4. Anticipated Specification		letailed c	hange(s) of it	ems requ	ired by Section 104.6 of the		
		letailed c	hange(s) of it	ems requ	ired by Section 104.6 of the		
Specification 5. Deadline fo	ons. 	r to obtai	(date)		ired by Section 104.6 of the		
Specification 5. Deadline fo	r issuing a change orde time or delivery schedu	r to obtai	(date)				

Δ	ddition	al C	omments:
$\overline{}$		и .	ommueins.

** Portion Below This Line To Be Filled Out by MoDOT **

Pleas		vsis performed by Shane Viers, Assistant to the Residented based on the factors mentioned in the analysis.	at Engineer. I concur that
	-	Deffen 7. Januar Submitted By Resident Engineer	4-5-10 Date
I con	ess and rejected due to the	ngineer's recommendation. This idea was discussed at he risk of pavement failure based on our previous expense.	•
	Approval Recommended Rejection	District Engineer ONR	4/7/10 Date
	Recommended	The state of the s	
Com	ments:		
	Approval Recommended		
	Rejection Recommended	Federal Highway Administration Required for FHWA Full Oversight Projects	Date
Com	ments:		
[]	Annuaval	PD	4/3/10
	Approval Rejection	State Construction and Materials Engineer	Date

Rt. 24 Randolph J2P0779C/J2P0779D ID# 100122-202

VE #1 - Leaving Concrete Driveways In Place @ STA 21+10 LT @ LM 81.190 WB and @ STA 66+50 RT.

	ı		Item Item Item	STA 21+10 LM 81.190 STA 66+ 50 TOTAL
			350 360 390 440	95 [,] 50 [,] 158 [,]
			303' X 8' = 269.33 SY 303' X 2' X 5.5" = 21.48 Tons @ \$20.12/TN 303' X 2' X 4" = 14.54 Tons @ \$58.33/TN 303' X 6' = 202 SY	
Total Savings APAC	Total Savings MoDOT	Total Savings	Savings Savings Savings Savings	
\$3,446.21	\$3,446.21	\$6,892.42	\$499.92 \$432.18 \$848.12 \$5,112.20	

J2P0779D/J2P0779C 100122-202 RTE 24 Randolph County

Project Office analysis of Value Engineering proposal #1.

Line No. 0360 Misc. Type 1 Base and Line No. 0390 Bituminous Base do not apply to the entrances in question. These were set up in the plans to be replaced with full depth widening to prevent the 2' thin spot in the entrances.

Line No. 0350 Type 1 Base (4") was calculated incorrectly. The actual savings for this line number should be \$1454.40.

Line No. 0440 Optional Widening should have been calculated at 8' wide rather than 6'. The actual savings for this line number should be \$9534.40.

Line No.	Description	Measurements	Unit Price	Savings
0350	Type 1 Base (4")	303'x8'=269.33SY	\$5.40/SY	\$1454.40
0440	Optional Widening	303'x8'=269.33SY	\$35.40/SY	\$9534.28
			Total Savings	\$10,988.80
4		·	MoDOT	\$5494.40
			APAC	\$5494.40

Although the contractor's proposal does appear to produce a savings to the contract, it is my recommendation that this VE proposal be rejected based on the past performance of an identical situation on J2P0748, RTE 63, Macon County. At this location, the decision was made to leave the concrete entrance in place for the Comfort Inn at the north end of Macon. The entrance was cored in several locations to determine the thickness and strength of the existing concrete. Thickness was determined to be greater than 7.5" and strength was in excess of 6500 psi. The entrance was left in place and overlaid with 1.75" of SP125.

After completion of the project, the condition of the area allowed to remain in place rapidly deteriorated. Not until complete failure of the area did we discover that the thickness of the concrete varied wildly, and the durability of the concrete was suspect. The resulting failure area, now much larger than the area originally planned for removal, had to be removed and replaced by MoDOT forces. The repair work was much more expensive than the savings realized during construction.

In my opinion, this VE proposal offers the same set of risks. Because the entrances were most likely constructed under permit by local contractors without adequate inspection of the subgrade or other materials used, including the concrete, we cannot reasonably predict their future performance.

Shane I. Viers, P.E.

Assistant to the Resident Engineer---Macon

Shave d. Viens

VALUE ENGINEERING CHECK SHEET

TYPE OF WORK (Check one that applies)	1000
(Check one that applies)	
 Bridge/Structure/Footings Drainage Structures (RCP, RCB, CMP's, ect.) TCP/MOT Paving (PCCP, ect.) Grading/MSE Walls Signal/Lighting/ITS Misc. 	

SU	MM_{f}	4RY	OF	PRC	PC	9S+	4 <i>L</i>
CTC							

(If needed, condense summary to a couple of lines)

LEAUE	(omprecin	L DRIVELAYS	- IN PLACE	- /NSSEAD
OF REPLAC	ING W/ NE	L DRIVEWAYS W FULL DEPTI	Y HMA.	
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

SCANNING OF DOCUMENT

If the proposal is large, please mark or there are special instructions, make no		to be scanned	d into the	database	. If
		1 Mar		ne ne harme benefit	